#### NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

#### IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

### SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

### **DIVISION SIX**

In re J.G., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law. 2d Juv. No. B296679 (Super. Ct. No. FJ55514) (Los Angeles County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

J.G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

J.G. appeals a juvenile wardship order. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602, subd. (a).) He was the subject of three delinquency petitions in 2018. A petition filed January 25, 2018, when J.G. was 15, alleged residential burglary and vandalism. (Pen. Code, §§ 459, 594, subd. (a).) A second petition alleging auto burglary was filed April 13, 2018. (*Id.*, § 459.)

J.G. admitted the April petition. The January petition was dismissed. The court declared him a ward of the court and placed him home on probation. In August 2018 he repeatedly missed community service; in September and October 2018 he tested positive for marijuana. The Probation Department deemed his progress "unsatisfactory."

A third petition filed October 15, 2018, when J.G. was 16, alleged first degree residential burglary; evading police in willful disregard for safety; and resisting or delaying an officer. (Pen. Code, §§ 459, 148, subd. (a)(1); Veh. Code, § 2800.2.) The petition was adjudicated in December 2018.

Aida O. testified that a hoodie-clad youngster knocked on the door of her home. She did not answer. Two more "kids" wearing hoodies left a nearby parked car and entered her back yard. When Aida saw a back doorknob turn, she fled while calling 911 on her cell phone. Soon after, she saw three people run from her home carrying pillowcases; they jumped in the getaway car and drove off just as police arrived. Inside the home, chest drawers were pulled out, clothing was strewn about and jewelry was missing.

Los Angeles police officer Hunter Kardinaal saw the suspects' Infiniti in front of Aida's home. The brake lights were on, indicating that a driver was inside. Three people in dark hoodies ran from the residence. They entered the car, which departed at high speed and did not yield to lights or a siren, driving 60-70 miles per hour on residential streets without slowing for stop signs.

The police pursuit continued onto the 118 Freeway, where the Infiniti travelled 130-140 miles per hour, weaving through lanes; the driver eventually crashed into another car and a retaining wall. Four people left the Infiniti and ran in all directions. Police quickly captured three suspects on the freeway.

The fourth person in the Infiniti ran down an on-ramp. He can be seen on dashboard camera images wearing a dark top. Police secured the area where he was last seen. A police K-9 was unleashed. Within 20 minutes, it found J.G., who did not react to officers' commands to come out. They pulled away branches and found him crouched on his knees in dense brush on the freeway embankment, wearing a black sweatshirt.

Officers recovered from the 118 Freeway a pillowcase with property that had been run over and damaged. Aida identified the property as hers. It included jewelry and two IPads, all damaged beyond repair, a loss of about \$15,000.

J.G.'s counsel moved to dismiss the case, arguing there was insufficient evidence J.G. participated in the crime because no one identified him at Aida O.'s house or leaving the Infiniti at the end of the pursuit. The court found there were four people in the car during the pursuit; three were promptly captured and J.G., who fit Aida's descriptions of the thieves, hid in the bushes, was found by a K-9, but refused to come out, showing consciousness of guilt.

The court sustained the petition against J.G. and placed him home on probation. He appealed. We appointed counsel to represent J.G. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On June 7, 2019, we advised J.G. that he could personally submit any contentions or issues within 30 days. We received no reply.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that J.G.'s attorney fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436,

441-443;  $People\ v.\ Kelly\ (2006)\ 40\ Cal.4th\ 106,\ 126.)$  The judgment is affirmed.

## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

### PERREN, J.

We concur:

YEGAN, Acting P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

### Robert Leventer, Commissioner

# Superior Court County of Los Angeles

\_\_\_\_\_

Michele A. Douglass, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.